

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DAT	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/694,860	10/29/2003	Kenneth A. Thomas	84820-4402 ADB	5712	
530	7590 10/0	4/2005	EXAMINER		
•	DAVID, LITTEN	JOLLEY,	JOLLEY, KIRSTEN		
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WESTFIELI	O, NJ 07090		1762	1762	
			DATE MAILED: 10/04/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7		
Office Action Summany	10/694,860	THOMAS, KENNETH A.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
TI MANUNO DATE CHI	Kirsten C. Jolley	1762			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	oears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 J	<u>uly 2005</u> .				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	=x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	o3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>12-23</u> is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected.	•				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement				
ordini(s) are subject to restriction unitare	·				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	,				
	Administration the disconding of the	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	to have been received				
 Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority document 	•	ion No			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	• •				
application from the International Burea	•	· .			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	∌d.			
Attachment(s)					
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
C.D			_		

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-11, in the reply filed on July 18, 2005 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the *liquid* laminating layer" [emphasis added] in line 2.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miekka et al. (US 6,540,865) in view of Xie et al. (US 6,503,620).

Miekka et al. discloses a method for forming a tape comprising: providing a base material having a first surface and a second surface; applying a first layer of a laminating pressure-sensitive adhesive (PSA layer) to cover the first surface of the base material; drying the PSA layer to provide a dry layer; applying a second layer of a melted hot melt adhesive (detackified layer, or DL) on top of the first layer; cooling the second layer to form a solidified layer of hot melt adhesive; forming the tape into a tape width by cutting; and winding the tape into a roll (col. 7, lines 50-57; col. 8, lines 49-51; col. 10, lines 5-7; col. 11, lines 43-62). Miekka et al. also teaches "it may be desirable to tint the DL to avoid having to use a tinted second substrate, or to avoid having to tint the PSA layer as the use of tint in the PSA layer may adversely affect its adhesive properties" (col. 32, lines 34-37). The Examiner notes that while Miekka et al. teaches away from the use of tint, or coloring agent, in the first PSA layer, the reference none-the-less teaches that it is known to use coloring agent in the PSA layer. Alternatively, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided coloring agent in the PSA layer upon seeing the teachings of Miekka et al. with the expected loss of adhesive properties of the PSA layer.

Miekka et al. teaches that the substrate may be in the form of any material suitable to act as a carrier for the construction, and preferred substrates include flexible materials that are sheet stock or roll or web stock (col. 7, lines 28-32). Miekka et al. lacks a specific teaching of applying its adhesive to a polymeric film. Xie et al. is cited for its similar teachings of a facestock material provided with two adhesive layers thereon to form a multilayer PSA

Application/Control Number: 10/694,860

Art Unit: 1762

construction. Xie et al. provides a list of exemplary facestock materials that are suitable flexible materials to form a construction with adhesives applied thereon, including a number of polymeric materials (col. 13, lines 20-43). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art, having seen the references of Miekka et al. and Xie et al. in combination, to have used a polymeric material as the base substrate in the method of Miekka et al. with the expectation of successful results since Miekka et al. generally discloses use of conventional flexible materials and is not limiting.

With respect to claim 2, Miekka et al. teaches that the laminate construction may be split lengthwise to form two or more different rolls (col. 8, lines 49-54). It would have been obvious to have wound the tapes into individual supply packages in order to sell them commercially.

As to claim 3, Xie et al. teaches that the polymeric base film may be polyethylene terephthalate in col. 15, lines 41-47.

As to claims 4-5 and 7, Miekka et al. teaches that its construction is then laminated to a second substrate which may be paper (col. 20, lines 21-26 and col. 21). It is the Examiner's position that the shape and end use of Miekka et al.'s construction is a matter of design choice that would be determined by one having ordinary skill in the art.

As to claim 6, Miekka et al. is silent with regard to the thickness of the base film. It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have determined the optimum base film thickness through routine experimentation depending upon the desired end use of the product, in the absence of a showing of criticality.

As to claim 8, Miekka et al. teaches that the first adhesive (PSA) layer may be applied as a liquid including solvent (col. 11, lines 53-62). As to claim 9, it would have been obvious to

have provided the coloring agent by admixing it with the liquid adhesive because such is a well known method in the coating art for coloring liquid adhesive layers.

As to claim 10, Miekka et al. teaches bonding the hot melt adhesive to a second substrate by heating the adhesive in col. 21, lines 10-18.

As to claim 11, Miekka et al. teaches that the base film preferably has a release material thereon (col. 7, lines 33-35), and the hot melt (DL) adhesive layer may be pressure-sensitive (col. 8, lines 55-58).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ugolick et al. (US 5,993,961) and Scholz et al. (US 6,083,338) are cited to demonstrate methods of forming constructions comprising a base film and two adhesive layers applied thereon.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kirsten C. Jolley whose telephone number is 571-272-1421. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/694,860

Art Unit: 1762

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kirsten C Jolley

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1762

kcj